

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13-18, 24-27, 32-37 and 54 are currently being cancelled (in order to obtain a quick allowance of this application, whereby cancellation of these claims does not constitute an agreement with the prior art rejections made in the Office Action with respect to these claims).

Claims 28-31, 38 and 39 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 28-31, 38 and 39 are now pending in this application.

**Comments Regarding Claims 28, 30 and 38:**

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 28<sup>1</sup>, 30 and 38 are not rejected over any cited art of record. Based on the amendments made to claims 28, 30 and 38 to place those claims in independent form to include the features of their respective base claim and any intervening claims, and due to the amendments made to claims 29, 31 and 39 so that they now depend from claims 28, 30 and 38, respectively, claims 28-31, 38 and 39 are now in allowable form, whereby any new prior art rejection of these claims would mandate a new, non-final Office Action.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is noted that the heading for numbered paragraph 4) on page 5 of the Office Action lists claims 1, 5 and 24-29 as being rejected anticipated by Petersen et al., but it is clear from reviewing the body of numbered

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claims 24, 29 and 32-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,154,777 to Ebrahim; claims 1, 5, 24-27 and 54<sup>2</sup> were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,985,964 to Petersen; claims 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen and U.S. Patent No. 6,016,512 to Huitema and further in view of Ebrahim; claims 6, 10 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Huitema; claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen and Huitema and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0080786 to Roberts; claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen and Huitema and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,974 to Loucks; claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Huitema and Loucks and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,870,550 to Wesinger; claims 31 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebrahim in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,838 to Squire; claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen and Huitema and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0031142 to Metin; claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ebrahim in view of Metin; and claim 31 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Metin. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Due to the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13-18, 24-27, 32-37 and 54, due to the fact that claims 28, 30 and 38 are not rejected over any cited art of record, and due to the fact that claims 28, 31 and 39 have been amended to respectively depend from claims 28, 30 and 38, these prior art rejections have been rendered moot.

---

paragraph 4) that claim 28 was not included in the details of this rejection, while claims 1, 5, 24-27 and 54 were the claims that should have been listed as being anticipated by Petersen et al.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 7, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck  
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819

---

<sup>2</sup> See footnote 1, above.